

**Company Name** Texas Instruments  
**Industry** ICT (Own operations and Supply Chain)  
**UNGP Core Score (\*)** 6.0 out of 26

Score	Out of	For indicators
<b>Governance and Policy Commitments</b>		
1	2	A.1.1 Commitment to respect human rights
0.5	2	A.1.2 Commitment to respect the human rights of workers
0	2	A.1.4 Commitment to engage with stakeholders
0	2	A.1.5 Commitment to remedy
<b>Embedding respect and Human Rights Due Diligence</b>		
Embedding respect		
0	2	B.1.1 Embedding - Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions
Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD)		
0	2	B.2.1 HRDD - Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts
1	2	B.2.2 HRDD - Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)
0	2	B.2.3 HRDD - Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action
0	2	B.2.4 HRDD - Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts
0	2	B.2.5 HRDD - Reporting: Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed
<b>Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms</b>		
1.5	2	C.1 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from workers
2	2	C.2 Grievance channels/mechanisms to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities
0	2	C.7 Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned
<b>6.0</b>	<b>26</b>	

(\*) Instead of the full list of indicators in the 2020 CHRB Methodology, this year's assessment uses the CHRB Core UNGP Indicators. These are 13 non-industry specific indicators that focus on three key areas of the UNGPs: high level commitments, human rights due diligence and access to remedy.

The 13 indicators selected from the full CHRB Methodology are scored on a simple unweighted basis, with a maximum of 2 points for each indicator for a maximum total of 26 points.

In addition, allegations of severe human rights impacts (Measurement Theme E) were also assessed but do not impact overall final scores

Please note that the "Not met" labels in the Explanation boxes below do not necessarily mean that the company does not meet the requirements as they are described in the bullet point short text. Rather, it means that the analysts could not find information *in public sources* that met the requirements *as described in full* in the CHRB 2020 Methodology document. For example, a "Not met" under "General HRs Commitment", which is the first bullet point for indicator A.1.1, does not necessarily mean that the company does not have a general commitment to human rights. Rather, it means that the CHRB could not identify a public statement of policy in which the company commits to respecting human rights.

## Detailed assessment

### Governance and Policies

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
A.1.1	Commitment to respect human rights	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: General HRs commitment: The Company indicates that it, 'in addition to complying with the applicable laws of the countries in which we operate, has an unwavering pledge to uphold human rights, ethical practices and a safe environment at all our operations, regardless of location'. [Business practices statement, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: UNGPs: The Company does mention the UNGPs but in its supplier Code of Ethics (RBA Code). The code (RBA code) states that 'In alignment with the UN Guiding Principles ...'. However, to be 'aligned with' is not considered a formal statement of commitment according to CHRB wording criteria. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 01/2018: <a href="#">wpl.ext.ti.com</a> &amp; Human Rights, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: OECD: The Company indicates that 'as a member of the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA), an industry coalition dedicated to corporate social responsibility in global supply chains, TI uses the RBA Code of Conduct (RBA Code) as a tool to align and adopt best practices on social, environmental and ethical responsibility – and we expect our suppliers to do the same. The RBA Code provides a set of industry standards that reference international expectations for human and labor rights, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ILO International Labor Standards and OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises'. The TI Supplier Code of Conduct is based on the RBA Code. However, no publicly available statement of policy committing it to the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises found. [Anti-Human Trafficking 2019, 05/2019: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.2	Commitment to respect the human rights of workers	0.5	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: ILO Core: The Company indicates that 'our commitment includes, but is not limited to: non-discrimination; (...); no child, indentured or prison labor'. However, the commitment to the right to freedom of association and to collective bargaining is not clear: 'TI adheres to country-specific laws as it relates to workers' rights to exercise freedom of association or expression. None of our operations are at significant risk for violating these principles'. Moreover, In the Anti-Human Trafficking Statement 2019, the company indicates that 'as a member of the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA), an industry coalition dedicated to corporate social responsibility in global supply chains, TI uses the RBA Code of Conduct (RBA Code) as a tool to align and adopt best practices on social, environmental and ethical responsibility – and we expect our suppliers to do the same. The RBA Code provides a set of industry standards that reference international expectations for human and labor rights, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ILO International Labor Standards and OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises'. However, the RBA code, in relation to collective bargaining (and freedom of association) includes a commitment 'in conformance with local law'. Is not clear if the Company is committed to provide alternative mechanisms or equivalent worker bodies in those places where these rights are restricted under local law. [Business practices statement, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a> &amp; Our Employees, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: UNGC principles 3-6</li> <li>• Not met: Explicitly list ALL four ILO for ICT suppliers: The Company uses the RBA as its Supplier Code of Conduct, which establishes the following labour standards: 'Forced, bonded (including debt bonded) or indentured labor'. 'Child labor is not to be used in any stage of manufacturing or in the provision of services or supplies.'; 'Suppliers should be committed to a workforce free of harassment and unlawful discrimination. Companies shall not engage in discrimination based on race, color, age, gender, [...] or marital status in hiring and employment practices such as wages, promotions, rewards, and access to training.'; 'In conformance with local</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>law, suppliers shall respect the right of all workers to form and join trade unions, of their own choosing, to bargain collectively and to engage in peaceful assembly as well as respect the right of workers to refrain from such activities.' However, it is not clear whether the Company is requiring the supplier to respecting the right to Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining in all contexts, as it indicates 'in conformance with local law' No further information found in the Anti Human Trafficking Statement 2019. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 01/2018: <a href="http://wpl.ext.ti.com">wpl.ext.ti.com</a> &amp; Anti-Human Trafficking 2019, 05/2019: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</p> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Explicit commitment to All four ILO Core: As mentioned above, the rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining are not clear. The Company has a briefing document about human rights in which it states that 'employees at any global operation have the freedom to associate and/or the right to collective bargaining as provided by local statute'. As in other cases, it is not clear if the Company is committed to equivalent worker bodies or alternative mechanisms in case 'local statute' restricts these rights. Also, it is not clear whether this statement is part of a formal policy statement. [Human Rights, n/a: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Respect H&amp;S of workers: The Company indicates that 'our commitment includes (...) safe and healthy work conditions'. [Business practices statement, n/a: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: H&amp;S applies to ICT suppliers: According to RBA, which is its supplier code, the Company indicates that 'participants recognize that in addition to minimizing the incidence of work-related injury and illness, a safe and healthy work environment enhances the quality of products and services, consistency of production and worker retention and morale. Participants also recognize that ongoing worker input and education is essential to identifying and solving health and safety issues in the workplace'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 01/2018: <a href="http://wpl.ext.ti.com">wpl.ext.ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: working hours for workers: The Company indicates that 'our commitment includes (...) fair and reasonable hours'. However, it is not clear it is a commitment to respect ILO conventions of working hours, or a specific commitment to regular working weeks, overtime, and breaks. [Business practices statement, n/a: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Working hours for ICT suppliers: Regarding its suppliers, the company indicates that 'working hours are not to exceed the maximum set by local law. Further, a workweek should not be more than 60 hours per week, including overtime, except in emergency or unusual situations. Workers shall be allowed at least one day off every seven days'. However, no evidence found of references to standard weekly hours or the Company explicitly committing to respect ILO conventions on working hours. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 01/2018: <a href="http://wpl.ext.ti.com">wpl.ext.ti.com</a>]</li> </ul>
A.1.4	Commitment to engage with stakeholders	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to stakeholder engagement: In its Employee Engagement Brief, the Company indicates that 'our long-term sustainability depends on our ability to engage Tiers so they feel connected, valued, and understand how their work contributes to our priorities and business strategy. Effective employee engagement is essential for improving performance, productivity, retention, and for driving growth and innovation'. Also, in the Anti-Slavery Statement, it assures that 'we also pledge to uphold human rights, ethical practices and a safe environment at all our operations, regardless of location, and engage with suppliers to ensure they are committed to the same principles'. Lastly, in TI's Stakeholder Engagement Brief, the Company indicates that what stakeholder engagement objectives are and lists them. However, no formal statement of commitment to engage with affected or potentially affected stakeholder was found. [Stakeholder Engagement, n/a: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a> &amp; Anti-Human Trafficking 2019, 05/2019: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder engagement: The Company indicates, in its Anti Human Trafficking Statement, that 'beyond the standards and policies that outline TI's expectations, we actively engage with stakeholders such as the RBA, Responsible Labor Initiative (RLI) and Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) to continuously improve our processes to help mitigate human rights risks in the supply chain'. However, no further evidence found that the company regularly engages with potentially and actually affecter stakeholders. [Anti-Human Trafficking 2019, 05/2019: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to engage stakeholders in design: The Company indicates that 'the relationship between our company and our stakeholders is dynamic. We tailor our engagement strategies, methodologies and communications to the unique interests of the people and organizations that directly influence or have an interest</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			in our operations'. However, there is no evidence of a publicly available statement of a policy which also commits it to engaging with affected stakeholders and/or their legitimate representatives in the development or monitoring of its human rights approach. [Stakeholder Engagement, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a> ] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Regular stakeholder design engagement</li> </ul>
A.1.5	Commitment to remedy	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to remedy: The Company indicates that 'slavery and human trafficking are taken very seriously. They are considered the most severe type of non-conformance and corrective action plans to remedy any identified instances of nonconformance are expected to be implemented at the shortest possible timeline'. Also, 'business relationships with suppliers that do not immediately remedy any non-conformances with regard to slavery and trafficking are subject to review and possible termination'. However, no commitment was found to remedy wrongs related to human rights in general (any adverse impacts that it has caused or contributed to). [Anti-Human Trafficking 2019, 05/2019: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Not obstructing access to other remedies</li> <li>• Not met: Collaborating with other remedy initiatives</li> <li>• Not met: Work with ICT suppliers to remedy impacts: The Company indicates that 'concerns identified as a result of the above assessment process, are escalated to our purchasing managers and suppliers for issues to be verified and corrective actions developed to address gap areas. Where necessary, TI provides suppliers with targeted training to help build supplier capability in areas requiring improvement. TI monitors suppliers' progress toward identified improvement plans to ensure corrective actions are implemented. However, no commitment to work with suppliers to remedy adverse impacts which are directly linked to its operations, through the business relationship own mechanisms or the development of third party non-judicial mechanism was found. [Supply Chain Management, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul>

## Embedding Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.1.1	Responsibility and resources for day-to-day human rights functions	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Commits to ILO core conventions: See indicator A.1.2</li> <li>• Not met: Senior responsibility for HR: The Company indicates that 'ethical responsibility begins at the top with our Chairman, President and CEO Rich Templeton. It's part of our culture, DNA and leaders at every level of the company are held accountable for compliance. The chief compliance officer works with the ethics director and others to oversee and coordinate the ethics and compliance program. Performance results are shared each year with the TI Audit Committee and TI senior managers'. Also, 'our ethics director updates committee members on human rights-related issues annually'. Finally, in Our Employees Topic Brief, the Company states that 'senior vice president, Human Resources establishes and maintains HR leadership, strategic direction and effective communication'. However, it is not clear which senior manager has the responsibility to oversee relevant human rights issues globally within the Company, as it seems there are different bodies and senior responsible for different issues, it is not clear if there's a senior role accountable for topics that include human rights. [Ethics, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a> &amp; Human Rights, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility</li> <li>• Not met: Day-to-day responsibility for ICT in supply chain</li> </ul>
B.2.1	Identifying: Processes and triggers for identifying human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Identifying risks in own operations: Although the Company indicates that 'our sites are required to build awareness of human rights among employees, identify risks and put processes in place to manage them', no further details found in relation to the process to identify which are the potential human rights risks and impacts in own operations. [Human Rights, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Identifying risks in ICT suppliers: The Company indicates that 'we assess our supply base annually against the policies and codes that reflect our standards and expectations. We prioritize suppliers to be assessed based on an annual risk analysis that considers suppliers' spend, criticality, products and services as well as geographic location. We identify high risk geographies using multiple sources, including the U.S. Department of State Trafficking in Person Report, the U.S. Department of Labor's List of Goods Produced by Child Labor or Forced Labor, the Corruption Perception Index and Foreign Migrant Worker indices'. However, the description of the process to proactively identify risks and impacts was not found, current evidence seems to focus in assessment of potential risks for each particular supplier and compliance monitoring. [Supply Chain Management, n/a: <a href="https://www.ti.com">ti.com</a> &amp; Anti-Human Trafficking 2019, 05/2019: <a href="https://www.ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Ongoing global risk identification</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: In consultation with HR experts</li> <li>• Not met: Triggered by new circumstances</li> </ul>
B.2.2	Assessing: Assessment of risks and impacts identified (salient risks and key industry risks)	1	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Salient risk assessment (and context): The Company indicates that 'We assess our supply base annually against the policies and codes that reflect our standards and expectations. We prioritize suppliers to be assessed based on an annual risk analysis that considers suppliers' spend, criticality, products and services as well as geographic location. We identify high risk geographies using multiple sources, including the U.S. Department of State Trafficking in Person Report, the U.S. Department of Labor's List of Goods Produced by Child Labor or Forced Labor, the Corruption Perception Index and Foreign Migrant Worker indices'. It indicates that examines risks and management systems of priority direct material and services suppliers using the RBA SAQ or internally development assessments that inquire into the demographics and existing policies at a facility level'. [Anti-Human Trafficking 2019, 05/2019: <a href="https://www.ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Public disclosure of salient risks</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.3	Integrating and Acting: Integrating assessment findings internally and taking appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Action Plans to mitigate risks: The Company indicates that 'beyond the standards and policies that outline TI's expectations, we actively engage with stakeholders such as the RBA, Responsible Labor Initiative (RLI) and Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) to continuously improve our processes to help mitigate human rights risks in the supply chain'. However, it is not clear the Company's global system to take action to prevent, mitigate or remediate its salient human rights issues. [Anti-Human Trafficking 2019, 05/2019: <a href="https://www.ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Not met: Including in ICT supply chain</li> <li>• Not met: Example of Actions decided: The Company claims that it has 'taken, or will take, the following steps to mitigate the risk that (our) CMs directly or indirectly finance or benefit armed groups in the Covered Countries (...): redistribute copies of our CM policy to Suppliers; emphasize to Suppliers our expectation that they respond fully and promptly to our information requests; instruct Suppliers to advise us if they determine that any person or entity in their supply chain is directly or indirectly financing or benefiting armed groups in the Covered Countries; encourage Suppliers to direct all Smelters in their supply chains to participate in the RMAP or a similar third-party audit program; and contact various Smelters directly for information if their operating status changed, their RMI status changed, or they have refused to participate in a RMI audit'. However, conflict minerals-related actions are assessed in their specific indicators. No further evidence found of a specific actions to mitigate other human rights risks. [2019 SD Form, 01/06/2020: <a href="https://investor.ti.com">investor.ti.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Both requirements under score 1 met</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
B.2.4	Tracking: Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions to respond to human rights risks and impacts	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: System to check if Actions are effective: The Company indicates that 'annually, targeted TI facilities and high-risk suppliers are audited. (...)The VAP assesses performance against the RBA Code, which evaluates labor, health and safety, environment, ethics and management systems. TI personnel also conduct their own audits to measure compliance with labor-related sections of the RBA Code. (...) A corrective action plan is developed for resulting nonconformances, which are tracked until closure'. However, no description found of a system(s) for tracking the actions taken in response to human rights risks and impacts assessed and for evaluating whether the actions have been effective or have missed key issues or not produced the desired results. This indicator does not look for specific outcomes of corrective action process for each supplier, but whether the Company is being able to prevent and/or mitigate risks to which it is exposed. [Anti-Human Trafficking 2019, 05/2019: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>Not met: Lessons learnt from checking effectiveness</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: Both requirement under score 1 met</li> </ul>
B.2.5	Communicating : Accounting for how human rights impacts are addressed	0	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: Comms plan re identifying risks</li> <li>Not met: Comms plan re assessing risks</li> <li>Not met: Comms plan re action plans for risks</li> <li>Not met: Comms plan re reviewing action plans</li> <li>Not met: Including ICT suppliers</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: Responding to affected stakeholders concerns</li> <li>Not met: Ensuring affected stakeholders can access communications</li> </ul>

## Remedies and Grievance Mechanisms

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
C.1	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from workers	1.5	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Channel accessible to all workers: The Company states that it offers its employees "several channels through which They can submit questions, concerns or grievances without fear of retaliation, including their supervisor, HR representative or anonymously through the Ethics Office". Tiers are Texas Instruments' workers. [Our Employees, n/a: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not met: Number grievances filed, addressed or resolved</li> <li>Met: Channel is available in all appropriate languages: The Company indicates that "to provide access to direct labor workers who don't use a computer daily or have an easy path to report ethics concerns or ask questions, we offer an online tool that is managed by a third party. It is accessible from a smartphone and translated in nine languages". [Ethics, n/a: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>Met: Expect ICT supplier to have equivalent grievance systems: According to the Suppliers Code of Conduct, as part of its management systems, suppliers are expected to have 'Ongoing processes, including an effective grievance mechanism, to assess employees' understanding of and obtain feedback on or violations against practices and conditions covered by this Code and to foster continuous improvement'. The Company uses the RBA Code as its Suppliers Code of Conduct: 'As a member of the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) (...) Texas Instruments (TI) uses the RBA Code of Conduct (Code) as a tool to align and adopt best practices and processes within our industry and encourage our first tier suppliers to do the same. (...) Participants must regard the Code as a total supply chain initiative. At a minimum, Participants shall also require its next tier suppliers to acknowledge and implement the Code'. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 01/2018: <a href="http://wpl.ext.ti.com">wpl.ext.ti.com</a>]</li> </ul>
C.2	Grievance channel(s)/mechanism(s) to receive complaints or concerns from external individuals and communities	2	The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows: Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Grievance mechanism for community: The Company indicates that 'Tiers, suppliers and other stakeholders can contact the TI Ethics Office without fear of retaliation or breach of confidence'. [Ethics, n/a: <a href="http://ti.com">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul> Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met: Describes accessibility and local languages: The Company indicates that 'to provide access to direct labor workers who don't use a computer daily or have an easy path to report ethics concerns or ask questions, we offer an online tool that is</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			<p>managed by a third party. It is accessible from a smartphone and translated in nine languages'. [Ethics, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: ICT supplier communities use global system: See above, channel is open to anyone to report about the Company and its suppliers. In addition, the Company indicates that 'if you become aware of any questionable activities involving Tiers or suppliers, please share your concerns immediately with any of the following TI individuals: any buyer/Worldwide Procurement &amp; Logistics (WPL) representative; worldwide Procurement &amp; Logistics Vice President Rob Simpson; TI Ethics and Compliance Director Gene Vallow'. [Ethical Expectations of our Suppliers, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> </ul>
C.7	Remedying adverse impacts and incorporating lessons learned	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Describes how remedy has been provided</li> <li>• Not met: Says how it would remedy key sector risks</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Changes introduced to stop repetition</li> <li>• Not met: Approach to learning from incident to prevent future impacts</li> <li>• Not met: Evaluation of the channel/mechanism</li> </ul>

### Performance: Responses to Serious Allegations (Not included in the overall score)

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
E(1).0	Serious allegation No 1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Headline:</b> Texas Instruments suppliers accused of forced labour on migrant workers in Malaysia</li> <li>• <b>Area:</b> Forced labour</li> <li>• <b>Story:</b> On June 28, 2019, Danwatch, a Danish investigative media and research centre, published an investigation report detailing alleged fundamental human and labour rights violations against Nepalese and Indonesian migrant employees working at Malaysian factories producing components for major electronics companies, including Texas Instruments.</li> </ul> <p>The report is based on interviews with workers employed by labour agency JS Global, which supplies workers to manufacturing companies, including German industrial group Possehl, which supplies products to Infineon, ST Microelectronics, NXP, Texas Instruments, Vishay and Diodes Inc.</p> <p>Employees reported several allegations constituting some form of forced labour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- excessive recruitment fees (exceeding amounts required by Malaysian government-approved agencies for the legalisation of workers' status)</li> <li>- arbitrary reductions of wages</li> <li>- violent threats when employees complained about wage reduction or non-payment</li> <li>- passport confiscation</li> <li>- excessive overtime work</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources: [Danwatch - 28/06/2019: <a href="#">danwatch.dk</a>] [[] []]</li> </ul>
E(1).1	The Company has responded publicly to the allegation	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Public response available</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Response goes into detail</li> </ul>
E(1).2	The Company has appropriate policies in place	2	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Company policies address the general issues raised: In its Topic Brief on Human Rights, the Company states it has policies on forced labour. [Human Rights, n/a: <a href="#">ti.com</a>]</li> <li>• Met: Policies apply to the type of business relationships involved: The Company's Supplier Code of Conduct includes the prohibition of the use of forced labour. [Supplier Code of Conduct, 01/2018: <a href="#">wpl.ext.ti.com</a>]</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met: Policies address the specific rights in question: The Supplier Code includes specific policy about debt bondage (including repayment of recruitment fees) and freedom of movement (including forbidding the confiscation of identity documents). [Supplier Code of Conduct, 01/2018: <a href="#">wpl.ext.ti.com</a>]</li> </ul>
E(1).3	The Company has taken appropriate action	0	<p>The individual elements of the assessment are met or not as follows:</p> <p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Engages with affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Encourages linked business to engage affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Provides remedies to affected stakeholders</li> <li>• Not met: Has reviewed management systems to prevent recurrence</li> </ul>

Indicator Code	Indicator name	Score (out of 2)	Explanation
			Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not met: Remedies are satisfactory to the victims</li> <li>• Not met: Has improved systems and engaged affected stakeholders</li> </ul>

## Disclaimer

A score of zero for a particular indicator does not mean that bad practices are present. Rather it means that we have been unable to identify the required information in public documentation.

See the 2020 Key Findings report and the 2019 technical annex for more details of the research process.

The Benchmark is made available on the express understanding that it will be used solely for general information purposes. The material contained in the Benchmark should not be construed as relating to accounting, legal, regulatory, tax, research or investment advice and it is not intended to take into account any specific or general investment objectives. The material contained in the Benchmark does not constitute a recommendation to take any action or to buy or sell or otherwise deal with anything or anyone identified or contemplated in the Benchmark. Before acting on anything contained in this material, you should consider whether it is suitable to your particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice.

The CHRB is part of the World Benchmarking Alliance ('WBA'). The material in the Benchmark has been put together solely according to the CHRB methodology and not any other assessment models in operation within any of the project partners or EIRIS Foundation as provider of the analyst team.

No representation or warranty is given that the material in the Benchmark is accurate, complete or up-to-date. The material in the Benchmark is based on information that we consider correct and any statements, opinions, conclusions or recommendations contained therein are honestly and reasonably held or made at the time of publication. Any opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date of the publication of the Benchmark only and may change without notice. Any views expressed in the Benchmark only represent the views of WBA, unless otherwise expressly noted.

While the material contained in the Benchmark has been prepared in good faith, neither WBA nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers or employees accept any responsibility for or make any representation or warranty (either express or implied) as to the truth, accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information contained in this Benchmark or any other information made available in connection with the Benchmark. Neither WBA nor any of its agents, representatives, advisers, affiliates, directors, officers and employees undertake any obligation to provide the users of the Benchmark with additional information or to update the information contained therein or to correct any inaccuracies which may become apparent (save as to the extent set out in CHRB appeals procedure). To the maximum extent permitted by law any responsibility or liability for the Benchmark or any related material is expressly disclaimed provided that nothing in this disclaimer shall exclude any liability for, or any remedy in respect of, fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation. Any disputes, claims or proceedings this in connection with or arising in relation to this Benchmark will be governed by and construed in accordance with Dutch law and shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Courts of Amsterdam.

As WBA, we want to emphasise that the results will always be a proxy for good human rights management, and not an absolute measure of performance. This is because there are no fundamental units of measurement for human rights. Human rights assessments are therefore necessarily more subjective than objective. The Benchmark also captures only a snap shot in time. We therefore want to encourage companies, investors, civil society and governments to look at the broad performance bands that companies are ranked within rather than their precise score because, as with all measurements, there is a reasonably wide margin of error possible in interpretation. We also want to encourage a greater analytical focus on how scores improve over time rather than upon how a company compares to other companies in the same industry today. The spirit of the exercise is to promote continual improvement via an open assessment process and a common understanding of the importance of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

### COPYRIGHT

Our publications and benchmarks are the product of the World Benchmarking Alliance. Our work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit [creativecommons.org](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)